

ant consisted essentially of pine oil and oil of Eucalyptus, small proportions of menthol, camphor, and creosote, soap, and water.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Korum*, misbranding, Section 403 (a), certain statements in the circulars entitled "Russell Poultry Medicines and Biologics," "Questions Often Asked by Poultry Raisers," "Turkey Pointers," "Chick Tips," and "Russell's Poultry Health and Disease Guide," which accompanied various shipments of the article, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious in the prevention and treatment of worms which infest poultry, coccidiosis, mycosis, blackhead, trichomoniasis, colds, roup, bronchitis, tracheitis, and diarrhea; that it would maintain health of poultry; that it was a mild laxative; that it possessed astringent properties; that it would aid in dissolving and removing mucus and slime from the digestive and intestinal tract; and that it would stimulate the appetite, aid in the raising of stronger chicks and healthier, husky, pullets and broilers, and be effective in promoting growth, health, and production of poultry. The article was not a mild laxative, it did not possess astringent properties, and it would not be efficacious for the purposes claimed.

Spray Inhalant, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the circulars entitled "Chick Tips," "Russell's Poultry Health and Disease Guide," "Questions Often Asked by Poultry Raisers," and "Turkey Pointers," which accompanied the article, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious as an aid in the relief and control of respiratory diseases which affect poultry, such as colds, roup, bronchitis, and tracheitis; that, when used as directed, it would act as a cleansing medication for the nostrils, mouth, eyes, throat, and lungs; that it would act as a stimulant to the respiratory membranes; and that it would be efficacious in the maintenance of the health of poultry. The article would not be efficacious for the purposes claimed.

DISPOSITION: April 16, 1945. A plea of nolo contendere having been entered on behalf of the defendant, the court imposed a fine of \$200 on count 1 and deferred sentence for 1 year on the remaining 3 counts.

1597. Misbranding of Pratts Poultry Regulator, Pratts Animal Regulator, and Pratts Poultry Inhalant. U. S. v. 40 Packages and 5 Drums of Pratts Poultry Regulator, 6 Packages of Pratts Animal Regulator, and 45 Bottles of Pratts Poultry Inhalant. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 13820. Sample Nos. 78063-F to 78065-F, incl.)

LIBEL FILED: September 26, 1944, District of New Jersey.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about July 31, 1944, from Philadelphia, Pa., by the Pratt Food Co.

PRODUCT: 21 2¾-pound packages, 19 25-pound packages, and 5 100-pound drums of *Pratts Poultry Regulator*; 6 2½-pound packages of *Pratts Animal Regulator*; and 21 1-pint bottles and 24 1-quart bottles of *Pratts Poultry Inhalant* at Brooklawn, N. J.

Analyses disclosed that the *Poultry Regulator* consisted essentially of calcium carbonate, with small proportions of iron oxide, copper sulfate, iodides, sulfur, and compounds of magnesium, manganese, nickel, and phosphorus, together with plant material including a strychnine-bearing drug; that the *Animal Regulator* consisted essentially of calcium carbonate, with small proportions of iron, copper, manganese, nickel, cobalt, and magnesium sulfates and carbonates, sulfur, and plant material, including a strychnine-bearing drug; and that the *Poultry Inhalant* consisted essentially of water, isopropyl alcohol, with small proportions of boric acid, formaldehyde, and eucalyptol.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Poultry Regulator*, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain label statements and certain statements on a poster entitled "More Eggs in 15 Days," in a booklet entitled "The Poultry Health Guide," and in a leaflet entitled "2¢ a Day Gets More Eggs from 100 Hens," which were shipped with the article, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be effective to regulate the body functions of poultry; that it would be effective as a tonic and appetizer; that it would be effective to make ordinary feeding mash better and to increase egg production; and that it would be effective in the prevention or treatment of deficiency diseases, limber neck, canker, tuberculosis, pullet disease (blue comb), chicken pox, and diphtheria. The article would not be effective for such purposes.

Animal Regulator, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain label statements and certain statements on a poster entitled "Keep Their Insides Earning" and in

a booklet entitled "The Poultry Health Guide," which were shipped with the article, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be effective to regulate the body functions of animals and to increase the flow of digestive juices; that it would be effective as a tonic, when used as directed; that it would produce the benefits implied by the phrase "Where hastened benefits are desirable"; that it would guard the animals against deficiency diseases due to all causes; and that it would increase profits as implied by the statement "Keep Their Insides Earning." The article would not be effective for such purposes.

Poultry Inhalant, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in the booklet entitled "The Poultry Health Guide," which was shipped with the article, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article, when used as a spray over poultry, as directed on the label, would be effective for the relief of coughs due to colds and for the relief of minor bronchial irritations; that it would be effective as a treatment for respiratory diseases of poultry; that it would cause poultry to cough and expel the exudate; and that it possessed inhibiting antiseptic properties within the respiratory tract. The article would not be effective for the purposes claimed and did not possess any inhibiting antiseptic properties within the respiratory tract.

DISPOSITION: March 2, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

1598. Misbranding of Wonder Poultry Tonic and Morehog. U. S. v. 64 Bottles and 6 Jugs of Wonder Poultry Tonic and 21 Bottles of Morehog, together with accompanying labeling. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 12624. Sample Nos. 40115-F, 40116-F.)

LIBEL FILED: June 13, 1944, Western District of Wisconsin.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about April 10, 1944, by the Wonder Chemical Co., from Minneapolis, Minn.

PRODUCT: 42 1-quart bottles, 22 1-pint bottles, and 6 1-gallon jugs of *Wonder Poultry Tonic*, and 21 1-pint bottles of *Morehog*, together with accompanying labeling, at Ettrick, Wis. The labeling included a number of hand-out cards, placards, streamers, and posters.

Analyses of samples disclosed that the *Poultry Tonic* consisted essentially of water, with small proportions of epsom salt, sulfuric acid, iron sulfate, sodium phenolsulfonate, alum, and 0.1 percent of a volatile oil; and that the *Morehog* consisted essentially of water, with small proportions of iron sulfate, epsom salt, sulfuric acid, boric acid, iron oxide, and not more than 0.2 percent of volatile oils, including oil of wormseed.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Poultry Tonic*, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the article were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article possessed significant therapeutic properties; that it was a tonic; that there was something wonderful about its composition; and that use of the article would prevent or cure disease conditions, thereby preventing losses in the raising of chicks. The article, when used as directed, had no value in the prevention and treatment of any disease condition affecting chicks and poultry.

Morehog, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the article were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article had medicinal value; that it would remove worms which infest hogs; that it was a tonic; that it was a conditioner; that it would cause hogs to gain more weight; that it was a stimulant to the appetite; and that it was beneficial to growing animals and those being fed for the market. The article had no medicinal value; it would not remove worms which infest hogs; it was not a tonic; it was not a conditioner, a term which implies that the article would improve the condition of hogs which were out of condition or off condition due to any number of causes, including disease; the article would not cause hogs to gain more weight, as the name "Morehog" and the statement in the labeling, "more hog gains," implied; it was not a stimulant to the appetite; and it consisted of nothing that was beneficial to growing animals and those being fed for the market.

DISPOSITION: September 21, 1944. No claimant having appeared, judgment of forfeiture was entered and the products, together with the accompanying labeling, were ordered destroyed.